

## The Worship of Confucius in Hiroshima

James McMullen, Oxford

During the Tokugawa period,<sup>1</sup> the religious cult of Confucius spread widely throughout Japan in the official domain schools (*hankō* 藩校) and in unofficial academies (*kajuku* 家塾 or *shijuku* 私塾). Confucius was worshipped in a ceremony known as the *sekiten* 稷奠 or *sekisai* 稷菜<sup>2</sup> or, occasionally, by the term *teisai* 丁祭 from the cyclical day of the month in which it was conventionally performed. In contrast to the cult in its homeland and in the adjacent polities of Korea and Vietnam, the liturgy of this ceremony in Japan was not laid down by law, nor was it standardized. No Japan-wide Confucian church was established that could impose uniformity on the ceremony. Rather, the ceremonies exhibit an exuberant variety in their sites, frequency, length and Confucian sectarian character.

This freedom allowed for liturgists of the Tokugawa period to draw selectively on the various different liturgical traditions that had developed in East Asia over the long period since the beginnings of the ceremony, traditionally at Confucius' grave side. Broadly, there were three such traditions available to Japanese liturgists as they drew up directives for their own ceremonies. Each of these had a different historical origin, reflected a different stage in the development of Confucianism itself and a different form of religiosity. The three traditions may also be classified according to a threefold classifica-

- 
- 1 This article is a by-product of my attendance at the conference 'Approaches to the Study of Japanese Culture and Thought in the Early Modern Age' held at the Goethe University, Frankfurt am Main, September 20th to 21st and organized by Professor Michael Kinski. I wish to express my gratitude to Professor Kinski and his colleagues and to Professor Bettina Gramlich-Oka, who drew my attention to much of the material on which the article is based. Certain aspects of the topics treated here, particularly the Kansei liturgical reform, will be covered in greater depth in my forthcoming monograph on the religious cult of Confucius in Japan.
  - 2 The distinction between these two terms was much discussed and not always consistent or clear. In general, the *sekisai* (literally 'offering vegetables') was thought of as smaller and excluded animal flesh offerings.

tion of rituals: ‘cosmic ordering’; ‘cultural display’; ‘ethical action’ or ‘moral redemption’.<sup>3</sup> First historically came the canonical form of the rite as an official state-sponsored ceremony, as it had been recorded in the earliest extant set of directives, the canonical Chinese *Da Tang Kaiyuan li* 大唐開元禮<sup>4</sup> of 732. This fits conveniently into the ‘cosmic ordering’ category. This ‘tends to occur in societies or political systems in which a central monarchical figure is holding together a large and not totally homogeneous polity’.<sup>5</sup> It was transmitted to Japan probably by the end of the eighth century and preserved in slightly modified versions in the *Engi shiki* 延喜式<sup>6</sup> of 927. Secondly, this ritual had been expanded in a variant form in ancient Japan, the chief fresh element of which was a sequence of ‘cultural display’. This featured versification and feasting following the end of the religious ceremony proper in the presence of the court senior nobility. Directives for this largely secular sequence are preserved in Heian period ritual manuals known generically as ‘ceremony books’ *gishiki sho* 儀式書. Finally, there had been developed in the Song Dynasty a more personal and devotional, smaller-scale, unofficial ritual that reflected the spirit of the Neo-Confucian revival. This was the creation of the great synthesizer of the Neo-Confucian tradition, Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130–1200). For this small, quasi-religious and voluntary community at his private ‘retreat’ (*jingshe* 精舍), he provided ritual directives for veneration of the Master and correlates including his predecessors in the Neo-Confucian movement, known as the *Cang zhou jingshe shicai yi* 滄洲精舍積菜儀 (hereafter ‘the retreat liturgy’).<sup>7</sup> Its important historical function was authoritatively to liberate the ceremony from its institutional connection with the state. This version stresses individual agency and clearly belongs to the ritual category of ‘ethical action’ and ‘moral redemption’. Despite their different forms of religiosity and different teleologies, these different liturgical traditions were ultimately all, like Confucianism itself, to a greater or lesser degree political, linked by the famous ‘eight-step’

3 This typology is modified from Catherine BELL: *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 1997: 185–91.

4 For the text, see IKEDA On 池田温, ed.: *Dai-Tō Kaigen rei* 大唐開元禮, Koten Kenkyū Kai, 1972 (photolithographic reprint of edition of 1886), *juan* 卷 53–54: 292A–302B.

5 BELL 1997: 187.

6 Text of directives for the metropolitan ceremony in KUROITA Katsumi 黑板勝美, ed.: *Shintei zōho Kokushi taikēi* 新訂増補国史大系, vol. 26, Yoshikawa Kōbun Kan 1965: 515–22.

7 Text in *Zhuzi wenji* 朱子文集, *Congshu jicheng* 叢書集成 edtn., Shanghai: Shangwu Yinshu Guan 1936, *juan* 卷13: 479–80.

linkage of the *Great Learning* to the goal of ‘illustrating’ virtue throughout the realm (*tianxia* 天下).<sup>8</sup>

This article looks at the *sekiten* ceremony of the domain school of the large Hiroshima *han* 藩 (426,000 石; *tozama* 外様; school first established in the Enkyō 延享 period [1744–48]: named successively: Keiko Yashiki 稽古屋敷; refounded in 1782 as Gakumon Jo 学問所 [also Gakkan 学館]; renamed Shūdō Kan 修道館 in 1866). This ceremony was established in 1790 by Rai Shunsui 頼春水 (1746–1816) and his younger brother Rai Kyōhei 頼杏坪 (1756–1834).<sup>9</sup> It is of particular interest for two reasons: first, because its liturgists and promoters, the Rai family, are well known for their pursuit of Confucian domestic ritual, recently explored by Minakawa Mieko 皆川美恵子<sup>10</sup> and Bettina Gramlich-Oka.<sup>11</sup> The present article is intended to complement their work; it addresses the public aspect of Shunsui’s Confucian religiosity. Second, the exclusive Zhu Xi school Neo-Confucianism of the leading Hiroshima domain Confucianist, Rai Shunsui, is regarded as one possible influence on the educational element within the Kansei 寛政 reform (1787–93) and more particularly on its imposition of the ‘Prohibition on heterodoxy’ at the Shōhei Zaka Gakumon Jo (hereafter referred to as the ‘Bakufu College’). This raises the question of whether, or how, the Hiroshima ceremony may also have contributed to the climate in which the slightly later Kansei liturgical reform of 1800, the climactic stage of the cult of Confucius in pre-modern Japan, was formed.

8 James LEGGE tr.: “The Great Learning: ‘The text of Confucius’”, *The Chinese Classics*, vol. 1 *Confucian Analects, The Great Learning, The Doctrine of the Mean*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press 1960 (reprint of Oxford, 1893 version): 357–58: “The ancients who wished to illustrate illustrious virtue throughout the kingdom, first ordered well their own states. Wishing to order well their States, they first regulated their families. Wishing to regulate their families they first cultivated their persons. Wishing to cultivate their persons, they first rectified their hearts. Wishing to rectify their hearts, they first sought to be sincere in their thoughts, Wishing to be sincere in their thoughts, they first extended to the utmost their knowledge. Such extension of knowledge lay in the investigation of things.”

9 For biographical sketches of the brothers, see KASAI Sukeharu 笠井助治: *Kinsei hankō ni okeru gakutō gakuha no kenkyū* 近世藩校に於ける学統学派の研究, 2 vols. [through pagination], Yoshikawa Kōbun Kan 1970: 1224–27. For contacts between members of the Rai family and other intellectuals of the period, see Anna BEERENS: *Friends, Acquaintances, Pupils and Patrons: Japanese Intellectual Life in the Late Eighteenth Century: a Prosopographical Approach*, Leiden: Leiden University Press 2006.

10 MINAKAWA Mieko 皆川美恵子: *Rai Shizuko no shufu seikatsu – Baishi nikki ni miru jukyō katei* 頼静子の主婦生活 – 『梅颯日記』にみる儒家家庭, Kirara Shobō 1997.

11 Bettina GRAMLICH-OKA: “Neo-Confucianism Reconsidered: *Family Rituals* in the Rai Household”, *U.S.-Japan Women’s Journal* 39 (2010): 7–37.

*Hiroshima domain Confucians*

The *sekisai* ceremony adopted from 1790 at the Hiroshima Gakumonjo reflected the strongly sectarian character of the school's Neo-Confucian orthodoxy. The extant version of the liturgical directives was initiated at the domain school some years after a factional struggle along Confucian sectarian lines among the domain Confucians had established Zhu Xi Neo-Confucianism as the basis of teaching at the school. A number of Confucian scholars had been employed in 1781 with the intention of re-establishing a school. However, an intense confrontation took place among them between the 'Eastern' (Shōsha 松舎 [Pine House]; Ko gakuha 古学派) group that owed allegiance to the tradition of Ogyū Sorai 荻生徂徠 (1666–1728) and the 'Western' (Chikusha 竹舎 [Bamboo House]; Shushi gakuha 朱子学派) group. The latter, led by Rai Shunsui, proved victorious. In 1790, the Sorai group led by Kagawa Nanpin 香川南浜 (1734–92) was expelled from the Hiroshima domain school.<sup>12</sup> Zhu

12 However, the now formally heterodox Kagawa school continued to be active in Hiroshima as the Shūgyō Dō 修業堂 after the expulsion from the official domain school. The Shūgyō Dō received some support from the domain, and is said to have had 'far more students than the [orthodox Zhu Xi] Gakumon Jo'. It had its own 'Confucius Shrine' (*Kōbyō* 孔廟) (Hiroshima Ken 広島県: *Hiroshima Ken shi* 広島県史, *Kinsei* 近世, vol. 2, Hiroshima: Hiroshima Ken 1984: 1042). There, according to the 1823 commemorative biography of Nanpin by Ichikawa Nei 市川寧 (1766–1831) religious ceremonies for the 'Former Sage and Former Teacher' (*sensei senshi* 先聖先師) were conducted annually from 1795/i/12. Kagawa Nanpin himself was also venerated, but at a separate altar in the eastern wing of the shrine, latterly on the anniversary of his death on vii/16 (NKSS 5: 192).

The locution 'Former Sage and Former Teacher' is ambiguous, and, given the doubts expressed by Sorai himself about Confucius' status as a sage, it is reasonable to ask who was venerated at this ceremony. *Sensei senshi* can refer generically to 'Former sages and Former Teachers' (see *Liji*: 'Wenwang shizi' 文王世子, James LEGGE, tr.: *Li Chi, with an introduction and Study Guide by Ch'u and Winberg Chai*, New York: University Books 1967, vol. 1: 347–48; SIKKZ 1: 514–15); but it was also commonly used in Japan from the time of the *Engi shiki* to refer to Confucius and Yan Hui, his favourite disciple. In the Tokugawa period, it was employed in this latter sense in liturgies initiated by Sorai school Confucians in domain schools where they predominated. This was probably not least because the *Engi shiki* ceremony did not mention Mencius, many of whose doctrines Sorai and his followers abhorred. A salient example is Hirosaki 弘前 domain school founded 1796. MONBUSHO 文部省, comp.: *Nihon kyōiku shi shiryō* 日本教育史資料, 9 vols., Fuzan Bō 1890–92 (hereafter NKSS), vol. 6: 53.). Here, the Tsugaru 津軽 daimyo of the time, Nobuharu 信明 (eighth lord) was a student of Usami Shinsui 宇佐見瀧水 (1710–76), a direct disciple of Ogyū Sorai. The Hirosaki directives simply mention 'the altar of the Former Sage' and 'the altar of the Former Teacher', but clearly refer to Confucius and Yan Hui. This same usage for the Hiroshima ceremony, together with the designation of the Shūgyō Dō building as a 'Confucius Shrine', seems to justify the interpretation that this ceremony venerated Confucius and Yan Hui and was a liturgical expression of the Sorai affiliation of the Shūgyō

Xi Neo-Confucianism was adopted as the exclusive orthodoxy of the domain school in 1785/xii.<sup>13</sup>

The Rai brothers came from a peasant provenance<sup>14</sup> but the family had recently become established as ‘a reasonably well-off family of dyers’ from Aki 安芸 (modern Hiroshima Prefecture).<sup>15</sup> As commoner Neo-Confucian scholars of the Zhu Xi persuasion, they invite comparison with their early Tokugawa predecessor, Nakamura Tekisai 中村惕齋 (1629–1702). Like Tekisai, their sectarian position was reflected in their choice of Zhu’s retreat liturgy for their ceremony to venerate Confucius. But there was a significant and illuminating difference. Tekisai had drawn up his liturgy in the relatively apolitical atmosphere of Kyoto; he had a genuine interest in Zhu Xi Neo-Confucian self-cultivation with a teleology or soteriology similar to the Buddhism with which

---

Dō and thus, in effect, an expression of dissent or protest against the domain’s established Zhu Xi orthodoxy.

This fact, given also the designation of the Shūgyō Dō as a ‘Confucius shrine’ points to the veneration of Confucius and Yan Hui.

Most of his followers who were in a position to initiate *sekiten* seem to have preferred the *Engi shiki* version. In both metropolitan and provincial versions of the ceremony in the *Engi shiki*, the ceremony is formally described as devoted to 先聖孔子宣王 and 先師顔子, but the proper names are largely dropped in the body of the text of the directives, where they are referred to simply as 先聖 and 先師. In Tokugawa practice among domain schools, many of those with Sorai school affiliation chose Confucius and Yan Hui as main recipients of veneration, rather than Confucius with the ‘four correlates’.

13 Document 13/7, “Hangaku hen (ge)” 藩学篇 (下), *Shunsui ikyō* 舜水遺響, Hiroshima Ken: *Hiroshima Kenshi: kinsei shiryō hen* 広島県史, *Kinsei* 近世, vol. 2, Hiroshima: Hiroshima Ken 1976 [hereafter SI]: 759; also ŌISHI Manabu 大石学: *Kinsei hansei hankō daijiten* 近世藩制藩校大事典, Yoshikawa Kōbun Kan 2006: 777. Other domains in which a Zhu Xi orthodoxy was established in advance of the Bakufu College were: Himeji 姫路 (1693); Kagoshima 鹿児島 (1773); Obama 小浜 (1682; by Ono Kakuzan 小野鶴山 (1701–70); Saga 佐賀 (1781), by Koga Seiri 古賀精里 (1750–1817; appointed to Bakufu College, 1796). Of these, Obama, Saga, and Hiroshima were closely mutually associated (KASAI 1970: 2089–90). For prohibitions on heterodoxy more generally in the domains, see *ibid.*: 2088–97. Other influential figures from the same general circle identified with orthodoxy were: Nawa Rodō 那波魯堂 (1727–89); Nishiyama Sessai 西山拙齋 (1735–98; Bitchū Kamogata 備中鴨方); Kan Sazan 菅茶山 (1748–1827; Bingo Kanbe 備後神辺); see MOTOYAMA Yukihiro 本山幸彦: *Kinsei kokka no kyōiku shisō* 近世国家の教育思想, Kyoto: Shibun Kaku Shuppan 2001: 102; and Anna BEERENS for biographical sketches and contacts.

14 RAI Noboru 頼襄 (San’yō 山陽; 1780–1832): “Senpukun Shunsui Sensei gyōjō” 先府君春水先生行状, GOKYŪ Toyotarō 五弓豊太郎 and GOKYŪ Tomotarō 友太郎: *Jijitsu bunpen* 事実文編, vol. 3, Kokusho Kankō Kai 1911: 84.

15 GRAMLICH-OKA 2010: 9. I am much indebted to Professor Gramlich-Oka for drawing my attention to such sources as Rai Shunsui’s diary and that of his wife and to other materials on which this essay is based.

he was conscious of competing, and which he so much resented. He had taken no form of service under the feudal order, but had pleaded for an ascetic Neo-Confucian practice seemingly independent of feudal authority. His ceremony is clearly to be classified as one of ‘moral redemption’ or ‘ethical action’ inspired by the personal pursuit of Neo-Confucian moral and spiritual values.

A century later, Rai Shunsui’s practice of Neo-Confucianism was much more closely imbricated with feudal authority. His appointment as a leading domain Confucian brought him a rise in status and an inextricable institutional relationship with the military authorities of the Hiroshima domain. There is little in his career to suggest dissatisfaction with the Tokugawa status quo; rather, he exploited it professionally for his advancement as a Confucian scholar. His mission was, first, the objectification of the Confucian life domestically in ritual in accordance with the prescriptions of Zhu Xi’s famous ritual handbook, the *Wengong jiali* 文公家礼 (Japanese reading: *Bunkō karei*) and more widely and publicly through the religious veneration of Confucius. But no less important was advocacy of intellectual and moral conformity in a society that he felt to be in crisis. In a letter of 1783 to the city magistrate of Hiroshima, Shunsui cited a specific canonical authority for his belief in ‘making manners conform’ (*dōzoku* 同俗): ‘This is the language of the “Royal regulations” (*Wang zhi* 王制) book of the *Book of Rites*’.<sup>16</sup>

The ‘Royal regulations’, a Han dynasty description of the institutions of an idealized regime, was an influential text among Tokugawa period Confucians. Significantly, it belongs to the ‘strong arm’ or authoritarian wing of Confucianism. For instance, it prohibits deviance and prescribes the death penalty for those who ‘studied wrong and rendered it erudite and obscure’ (*xuefei er bo* 学非而博).<sup>17</sup> Most important in the present context, the ‘Royal regulations’ also establishes a link between ritual practice and the imposition of doctrinal orthodoxy and intellectual conformity. The ‘Minister of instruction’ in this ideal order ‘defined and set forth the six ceremonial observances’ (*liuli* 六礼), which included both familial (marrying, mourning) and more collective, pub-

16 “Kyōdō no koto ni tsuki machi bugyō e no tōsho” 教導の事につき町奉行への答書, *Ken-gen ōmon hen* 献言応問篇, SI 684. For a more detailed account of Shunsui’s views on orthodoxy, see Robert L. BACKUS: “The Motivation of Confucian Orthodoxy in Tokugawa Japan”, *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 39. 2 (1979): 291–97.

17 LEGGE 1: 237 (adapted); *Sentetsu icho kanseki kokuji kai* 先哲遺著漢籍国字解 (hereafter SIKKZ), Raiki 礼記, Waseda Daigaku Shuppan Bu 1914, vol. 1 (jō 上): 378, where *bo* 博 is glossed as 涉獵することひろく窮詰すべからざる (erudite and not to be pinned down).



lic rituals (sacrifices' [*ji* 祭]; feasting).<sup>18</sup> At the same time, this official also 'taught the sameness of the course of the Way and virtue, to make manners conform' (*yi daode yi tongsu* 一道德以同俗).<sup>19</sup> This was the text on which, earlier in the Tokugawa period, the military government's Confucian advisor, Hayashi Razan 林羅山 (1583–1657), had drawn to plead shrilly for the death penalty for doctrinal deviance deriving from 'heterodoxy' (*igaku* 異学; *sc.* deviance from Zhuzi Confucianism).<sup>20</sup> Shunsui's advocacy of orthodoxy was altogether gentler than Razan's, but in this same source he found confirmation of the responsibility of Confucians both to exemplify Confucian ritual in their domestic and public lives and to promote a stern discipline and conformity of thought in society and, accordingly, to prohibit heterodoxy.

The Rai family took its mission of exemplifying Confucian ritual conscientiously. Their attempt in their own lives to follow domestic Neo-Confucian rituals prescriptions is excellently documented in a recent article by Bettina Gramlich-Oka, which chasteningly focusses on the essential contribution of Shunsui's wife Shizu to what was a family project.<sup>21</sup> No doubt their motivations in accepting this Confucian mission in their own world were complex. Gramlich-Oka relates the intensity of the Rai household's domestic ritual programme to the insecurity of commoners in a samurai world; Shunsui's 'demonstration to samurai of his capacity to lead a model life was one strategy to better himself in the eyes of his de facto superiors.'<sup>22</sup>

The pattern of domestic ritual in Rai Shunsui's household went beyond kinship rituals to include observances which had wider political significance; it offers a paradigm of Shunsui's religious commitments and the attitudes that distinguish him from Tekisai. The kinship and seasonal rituals follow Zhu Xi's *Wengong jiali*, as, in general pattern, had Tekisai himself who had also claimed that they were for commoners.<sup>23</sup> But the Rai domestic annual schedule of rites extends to the feudal context of their lives through the religious cult of do-

18 LEGGE, tr.: *The Li Chi*, vol. 1: 248; SIKKZ, *Raiki*, vol. 1: 395.

19 LEGGE, tr.: *The Li Chi*, vol. 1: 230–31; SIKKZ, *Raiki*, vol. 1: 369.

20 For references, see James McMULLEN: "Confucianism, Christianity, and Heterodoxy in Tokugawa Japan", *MN* 65.1 (2010): 161, 173.

21 See GRAMLICH-OKA, *passim*.

22 GRAMLICH-OKA 2010: 10.

23 SHIBATA Atsushi 柴田篤: "Nakamura Tekisai" 中村惕齋, *Sōsho Nihon no shisō ka* 叢書日本の思想家, vol. 11, Meitoku Shuppan Sha 1983: 81.

main ancestral rulers: the Rai family commemorated the death anniversaries of domain lords on seven days through the year; quantitatively, even for this household not of samurai status, the ritual obligations to feudal lords were more exigent than those of Confucius himself.<sup>24</sup>

These domestic, but none the less also political, rituals reflect Shunsui's professional career in the service of his feudal domain. In addition to headship of a household, Shunsui was commissioned to lead the Hiroshima domain school, the Gakumon Jo. This was an institution that admitted some 280 students and allowed 'peasants, artisans and merchants' to attend lectures. Shunsui was in no doubt as to the empowering nature of his role. He conceded that 'it is obvious that, at present, the rank and emoluments [of a Confucian's office] are everywhere extremely low'. None the less, 'the Confucian is the basis not only of the feudal household, but of the administration and education of the whole province.' He was 'one who acts as the intermediary of the Sages and Worthies', so that 'a single word or a single matter of misapprehension high up injures (*sokonai*) the lord, and lower down causes his subjects to go astray'.<sup>25</sup> His concept of his responsibility impelled Shunsui to pursue the broader socio-political unity prescribed in the 'Royal regulations'. In this he achieved success; as noted, Zhu Xi Neo-Confucianism was adopted as the exclusive orthodoxy of the domain school in 1785/xii.

### *The religious cult of Confucius in Hiroshima*

Given his educational office and commitment to ritual and to Zhu Xi orthodoxy, it is not surprising that Shunsui should look to the *sekiten* or *seksai* ceremony to sacralize the Zhu Xi Neo-Confucian teaching and his own mission to his domain. The notice of the Hiroshima cult of Confucius in the *Nihon kyōiku*

---

24 For a table of the ritual observances in the Rai household, see GRAMLICH-OKA 2010: 17. The cult of rulers' ancestral spirits was, of course, not necessarily in principle in conflict with the cult of Confucius; after all, throughout East Asia, ruler ancestral cults were widespread and co-existed with the *sekiten*. It was only when, as was to occur in nineteenth-century Japan, ancestral cults rested on religious or mythical assumptions at variance with those of Confucianism that tensions and difficulties occurred. Put differently, when ancestral cults (including that of the Sun Goddess) sacralized a different moral and metaphysical vision of the world and more particularly of Japan, there could be a tension that impacted on the practices of Confucian liturgy.

25 RAI Shunsui: "[?] Ma-monogatari" 間ものがたり, SI 785.



*shi shiryō* 日本教育史資料, the Meiji government's compendium on Tokugawa education, states that the domain had a shrine,<sup>26</sup> and that the *sekiten* ritual was performed in spring and autumn, with 'performance of music and with offerings in round vessels (*ho* 簋); square vessels (*ki* 簠); stemmed vessels (*hen* 簋); and covered stemmed vessels (*tō* 豆)'.<sup>27</sup> A summary of the Hiroshima directives is supplied in the separate volume of *Nihon kyōiku shi shiryō* that includes a 'Sacrificial ceremonies' section.<sup>28</sup> A more detailed source, however, is the Asano 浅野 Library's unpaginated manuscript *Teisai gisetsu* 丁祭儀節 [Procedures for the Ding sacrifices] by Shunsui's younger brother and fellow Kimon (崎門) scholar, Rai Kyōhei, dated 1790/ii.<sup>29</sup>

Rai Kyōhei's<sup>30</sup> *Teisai gisetsu* is resolutely Chinese. It is textually indebted to Zhu Xi's retreat liturgy; indeed, it echoes the wording of Zhu's directives, for instance in referring to contemporary substitutions of less expensive paraphernalia with the words 'now we use' or 'present use' (*kin'yō* 今用).<sup>31</sup> Other Chinese sources listed by Kyōhei range from the *Dai Tang Kaiyuan li* to the up-to-date *Wuli tongkao* 五礼通考 compiled by 1753 by Qin Huitian 秦蕙田.<sup>32</sup>

26 NKSS 2: 655; the date of construction of the shrine is not mentioned.

27 Ibidem.

28 NKSS, vol. 6: 110–11. This source contains a skeletal set of directives for an ambitious ceremony staffed by a total of 48 officiants. Music (*gagaku* 雅楽; differentiated for spring and autumn), incense, offerings to main venerand, an invocation, correlates and subsidiary venerands are specified. There is, however, no text of the invocations and a general lack of detail. 'Swordsmen', not specified in Kyōhei's MS version (see following note) are specified here, presumably to take charge of the weapons of samurai participants.

29 Asano Library. I am grateful to the Hiroshima City Central Library for supplying a photocopy of this text. The title of the ceremony as 'Ding sacrifice' [i.e. sacrifice on the *hinoto* day rather than *sekiten* or *sekisai*] was explained as reflecting the daimyo's modest feeling that the ceremony did not conform completely with Chinese practice; (SHUNSUI: *Chikukan shōroku* 竹館小録, SI 778; also *Hiroshima kenshi*, Kinsei 2: 1034). The two sources for the ceremony correspond in outline, though the NKSS summary, possibly representing a later version of the ceremony, calls for some 48 roles; *Teisai gisetsu* omits many minor liturgical roles, stipulating that the names of 23 officiants be posted in advance of the ceremony.

30 Shunsui's frequent absence in Edo following his 1783 representations to his daimyo, may be one factor that helps explain why his younger brother prepared these directives.

31 The Rai recension specified substitutes: 'jar' (*koson* 壺尊) for 'tall vessel' (*son* 罍) and 'earthenware bowl' (*gahan* 瓦盤) for 'bamboo stemmed bowl and lidded stem bowl' (*hentō* 簋豆). This substitution may have been legitimated by similar substitutions in the *Zhuji wenji* 朱子文集 text (p. 479): thus *qipān* 漆盤 [lacquer bowl] for *bian* 簋 and *dou* 豆, and similarly 'ceramic beaker' (*wazun* 瓦尊) for 'ox-shaped vessel' (*xizun* 犧尊).

32 Other Chinese sources mentioned are MA Duanlin 馬端臨: *Wenxian tongkao* 文献通考;

No reference is made to Heian period sources, but two more recent Japanese sets of directives are listed: a Rinke 林家 academy set from Edo, *Tōto kokuji kai sekiten gichū* 東都国学積奠儀注,<sup>33</sup> together with Nakamura Tekisai's *Tekisai Sensei sekisai gisetsu kōgi* 惕齋先生積菜儀節考議,<sup>34</sup> perhaps the major source. Unlike Tekisai's directives, however, the Rai do not affect Chinese pronunciations. *Teisai gisetsu* is distinguished from Tekisai's version further by the inclusion of a rich and sophisticated use of *gagaku* 雅樂, totalling 18 pieces differentiated by season, if variations on the same piece are included. Thus at the early 'raising of the curtain' (*jōchō* 襄帳) stage of the ceremony after positions have been taken up, in spring *Shuntei gaku* 春庭樂 is played, in autumn, *Banzai raku* 萬歲樂.<sup>35</sup> External evidence suggests that this feature could have been sponsored by the Hiroshima daimyo himself; he 'ordered' performance from musicians from the local source of the famous Shinto votary shrine at Itsukushima 嚴島, where 'there were large numbers of musical houses'.<sup>36</sup> Music, however, was to be the only gesture to 'cultural display' in this spare version of the ceremony. Though Shunsui himself was a keen composer of Chinese verse (*kanshi* 漢詩), the choice was made not to follow the contemporary (pre-reform) Edo Rinke and others in incorporating verse composition into the Hiroshima version of the ceremony.

---

*Houguo tongshi yili* 侯國通祀儀禮 (unidentified, but cited also by Nakamura Tekisai); LI Zhizao 李之藻: *Pangong liyue shu* 領宮禮樂疏; LI Dongyang 李東陽: *Da Ming huidian* 大明會典.

33 Probably to be identified with the *Kokugaku sekiten gichū* 国学積奠儀注 (1778) by Seki Shōsō 関松窓 (Shūrei 修齡; Eiichirō 永一郎; sometimes Eijirō 永二郎; ?-1801); MS in Naikaku Bunko 和-35705.

34 Unpaginated MS in Kokkai Tosho Kan, *Meien Kan sōsho* 明遠館叢書, *kan* 卷 22 (33/9/63); *Tekisai Sensei bunshū*, *kan* 8; preface reprinted in SHIBATA 278-79.

35 The *gagaku* programme by title is as follows:

Stage of rite	Spring	Autumn
序立於堂前	乱声	新羅乱声
襄帳	春庭樂	萬歲樂
進饌	賀殿	林歌
分奠	迦隆頻	陪臚
獻酒	春鶯囀颯踏	常樂
文獻	春鶯囀入破	三台塩
徹饌	蘭陵王	合飲塩
垂帳	酒胡子	還城樂
詣坎所	武德樂	長慶子

36 SHUNSUI: *Chikukan shōroku* 竹館小録, SI 778.

In other respects the directives are close to Tekisai's and share his adaptations of the Zhu Xi retreat liturgy to a school institutional setting, for instance in posting a roster advertising the ceremony and its participants in advance. As normal in the Tekisai tradition, abstinence of two relaxed and one intense day was prescribed for the main celebrant (*seiken kan* 正獻官) and for the invocationer (*shuku* 祝); one night of 'clean abstinence' for assistant officiants and students. Offerings, however, are not specified, though they seem to have included a pheasant rather than the hare of the Tekisai directives.<sup>37</sup> Libation trays of reeds and sand (*bōsha ban* 茅沙盤) are to be set up in front of the altars of the Sage himself; the correlates Yan Hui 顏回, Zeng Zi 曾子, Zi Si 子思, and Meng zi 孟子 (Mencius); and the five 'subsidiary venerands' (*jūshi* 從祀), leading figures of the Song Neo-Confucian movement: Zhou Dunyi 周敦頤 (1017–73); Zhang Zai 張載 (1020–77), Cheng Hao 程顥 (1032–85), Cheng Yi 程頤 (1033–1107), Zhu Xi.<sup>38</sup> As in the Zhu Xi retreat ceremony, the central liturgical act is pouring 'three sacrifices' on the reeds by the single main sacrificer (before each venerand), followed by a reading of the invocation. After the completion of the ceremony with the burning of the invocation and burial of 'wine and offerings', the officiants are seated in order in the Sōsha [Pine House], where they 'drink the wine of good fortune and [eat] remainders from the sacrificial offerings, salute each other and leave'.

Overall, Rai Kyōhei's set of directives is marked by a close attention to liturgical detail that may reflect the need for guidance among performers unfamiliar with Chinese liturgy. Perhaps it also reflects a special Rai meticulousness in matters of Confucian liturgy. Thus the action of taking the boxes of offerings from the 'spirit kitchen' (*shinchū* 神廚) at the south east corner of the shrine court is to be performed by specially designated 'passers of the offerings' (*denkyō sha* 伝供者). The offerings are to be handed to the 'placing officers' (*tenkan* 奠官; also referred to as 'subsidiary libationers' (*bunken kan* 分獻官), who 'advance and genuflect' (*ki* 跪) in front of the main altar, open

37 Shunsui seems to have proposed that 'with regard to the fact that hitherto the oblations and paraphernalia of the Sage's altar have been extremely meagre (*kyūhaku* 菲薄), I wish next time to augment them with bird flesh'; "Kōjō no oboe" 口上之覚, dated i/25; "Hangaku hen (jō)" 藩学篇 (上), SI 701. This is undated as to year. However, in his diary *Shunsui nikki* 春水日記 in *Rai Sanyō zensho*, *furoku* 頼山陽全書附録. Hiroshima Ken: Rai San'yō Sensei Iseki Kenshō Kai, 1931; references to diaries are by date of entry rather than by page no. Shunsui records on 1792/ii/10, the day following the ceremony, that he had received a pheasant offered at the *Teisai*. Cf. also entries for 1793/ii/9, 1796/ii/21.

38 Referred to by their ennobled titles in Kyōhei's text.

the boxes and offer the offerings deployed as in the diagram'. After bowing (*hai* 拝),<sup>39</sup> they 'take the empty boxes, withdraw, and stand in front of the [kitchen] room; the passers of the offerings advance and receive [the empty boxes], withdraw and place them in the kitchen; the placing officers return to their positions; the music stops'.

### *A politicized ritual*

Closely based as it is on Zhu's retreat directives and their redaction by Teki-sai, this ceremony might suggest a relatively non-political ritual, intended to empower practising Confucians, to sacralize their Neo-Confucian project as individual practitioners of the Neo-Confucian path. No doubt this was among its significances for many participants. The doctrinal commitment to orthodoxy and to Zhu Xi's transmission of the Way (*daotong* 道統) is made explicit not only by the choice of Zhu's own liturgy, but also by the altars of the Neo-Confucian subsidiary venerands and the explicit inclusion of their names in the invocation.

But Shunsui's declared wider concern with moral revival and intellectual conformity within his community went beyond exemplifying personal devotion to Confucius to confer a political and evangelical aspect to his ceremony. He wished to invoke the personal moral and political authority of the Hiroshima ruler himself to bestow domain-wide authority on this project. His concern with political authority found an explicit liturgical expression foreign to Zhu's original relatively apolitical liturgy. He achieved this in two ways. First, the representation of Confucius by the 'host' in the Sage's hall offered a way to intrude the authority of the daimyo symbolically into the ceremony. According to the *Nihon kyōiku shi shiryō*, its 'Sage's throne' was a tablet with the eight characters inscribed 'Spirit Tablet of the Perfect Sage and Former Teacher Confucius' 至聖先師孔子神位 in the autograph of the sixth [*sic*] Hiroshima daimyo,<sup>40</sup> Asano Shigeakira 淺野重昂.

Shunsui's initiative to use the 'host' to symbolize this signal political support is well documented. In a lengthy memorial of 1783 to Shigeakira, Shunsui discussed the iconographic representation of Confucius in the Sage's shrine. How Confucius and the correlates should be represented in the ceremony

---

39 A feature of the text is that, unusually, the number of obeisances or bows is not specified.

40 For Kasai, Shigeakira is the seventh Asano daimyo.

had long been debated in both China and Japan. The controversy concerned whether an anthropomorphic image (sculpture or painting) or an aniconic tablet was preferable as the ‘host’ to lodge the spirits during the ceremony.<sup>41</sup> Shunsui acknowledged that there were differences of opinion on this matter. He himself, like Zhu Xi (but in contrast to Tekisai), was in favour of the aniconic wooden tablet. He quoted in support the aniconic views of the Ming scholar Qiu Zhuanshan 邱瑒山 (1421–95; Ming scholar and grand secretary)<sup>42</sup> that the reason that an enlightened lord<sup>43</sup> excelled in past and present was that he ‘made the host of the sage’s shrine a wooden tablet’. Now, for Hiroshima, Shunsui urged that a similar wooden tablet replace the existing picture hitherto used in the domain. Most important, this tablet should be inscribed in the hand of the daimyo himself.

Deeply modest though I have the privilege of observing you to be, Sir, timorously [I suggest that] for you to write the sacred title of the spirit tablet [in your own hand] is an appropriate action for [one in] your honourable status as the exalted Governor of the Province.[...] [O]nce it is in your hand, [students] paying their respects on entry to the school will venerate the Sage and Worthies of course, but will additionally feel gratitude for having the privilege of paying respects to your calligraphy; and your feudal household and the people of your domain, Sir, will be unable to refrain from coming to pay respects just to this [calligraphy].<sup>44</sup>

Like his appeal for ‘orthodoxy,’ Shunsui’s solicitations to his daimyo for endorsement of the sacrality of Confucius succeeded. The duly inscribed tablet was announced to the domain as conveying the daimyo’s ‘respect and faith, wholly for the moral improvement (*fūka* 風化) [of his domain]’<sup>45</sup>

41 See Deborah SOMMER: “Destroying Confucius: Iconoclasm in the Confucian Temple”, Thomas WILSON, ed.: *On Sacred Grounds: Culture, Society, Politics and the Formation of the Cult of Confucius*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press 2002: 95–133.

42 SOMMER 2002: 118–26, where he is referred to as Qiu Jun 邱濬.

43 Shunsui may have referred here in particular to Ming Taizu 明太祖 (r. 1368–98); SOMMER 2002: 109–10.

44 “Gakumon Jo seizō narabi ni madori nado no koto ni tsuki kakitsuke” 学問所聖像並に間取などのことにつき書付, “Hangaku hen (jō)”, SI 704. Asano Shigeakira subsequently expressed the wish to replace his calligraphy with that of a courtier or someone better qualified, but was over-ruled by his feudal household; *Chikukan shōroku*, SI 778.

45 *Shunsui nikki*: 1783/x/8, recording a communication dated to 8th month from the domain authorities.

The host tablet of Confucius, as Shunsui had pleaded, inscribed in the hand of the daimyo, was not the only political gesture in the ceremony. Perhaps even more important was the invocation, for that dated the ceremony and identified the agency of the ceremony and set it in its socio-political context. According to a note in Shunsui's brief history of the 'Bamboo Hall' [Chikukan 竹館], the Hiroshima invocation, along with 'who the director of the sacrifice [is to be] and the style of the written signatory', was determined 'by discussion' (*giron* 議論), presumably among the academic community and domain officials.<sup>46</sup> It was evidently decided that the daimyo be the explicit authority for the ceremony. Kyōhei's directives cite 'His Excellency' (*kō* 公; *sc.* daimyo) as the agent initiating the sacrifice. The wording ran: 'His Excellency appointed to such and such a rank ordering a certain person of a certain office to perform the sacrifice'.<sup>47</sup> This wording differs from many of the Tokugawa period ceremonies based on Zhu Xi's retreat liturgy, where the agency cited in the invocations is normally, less politically, that of the Confucian school official alone acting as an agent independent of feudal authority.<sup>48</sup>

46 SHUNSUI: *Chikukan shōroku*, SI 778.

47 *Kō gui bōkan nanigashi ni mejite, tsutsushimite sai wo itasu* 公具位命某官某敬致祭.

48 The agency for 'retreat'-based ceremonies is as follows: Nagoya 名古屋: 'Latter-day student Kōgaku Fuse Ian' 後学布施維安 (*Nagoya sōsho* 名古屋叢書, reprinted edtn., vol. 1, Nagoya: Nagoya Shi Kyōiku Iinkai 1982: 13); for the Hagi 萩 (autumn liturgy): 'Head of School (*Gakuchō* 学長) Ogura Sadataka 小倉貞敬 (Shōsai 尚齋; 1677–1737; domain Confucianist; NKSS 6: 126); for the ceremony at the Okayama 岡山 domain's Shizutani 閑谷 commoner school, the invocation was made in the name of 'the director of the Shizutani School Director 学監 in Wake 和気 County in the Province of Bizen 備前, Tsuda Nagatada 津田永忠' (1640–1707; domain administrator; NKSS 6: 109). Exceptions are found where the daimyo himself participated actively in the ceremony and is cited as agent or was particularly interested in the cult of Confucius, as appears not to have been the case in Hiroshima. Thus in the ceremony inaugurated from 1682 at the Okayama domain school based on the Zhu Xi retreat liturgy through the influence of Ichiura Kisai 市浦毅齋 (1642–1712), the daimyo himself participated, conferring an official status on the ceremony (NKSS 6: 108). At the Tekisai-derived ceremony at Taku 多久 sub-fief in the Saga 佐賀 domain the extant invocation cites the agency of the 'Taku Village chief' (Taku *yāshu* 多久邑主; *sc.* ruler of Taku sub-fief) as 'commissioning' his 'Confucian minister (*jushin* 儒臣, NKSS 6: 148). At the important Rinke service in Edo itself, the invocations (as opposed to 'announcements' [*kokubun* 告文]) for the early ceremony, which was certainly based on Zhu's retreat version, are not preserved until 1670. By that time the ceremony had evolved in the direction of a semi-official rite and the Ming state invocation had been adopted, but the agency cited in the invocation remained with the Hayashi; later and until the Kansei Reform, the locution 'under orders' (*mei* 命), but from whom unspecified, was employed; INUTSUKA Innan 犬塚印南: "Shōheishi" 昌平志, *Nihon Kyōiku bunko*, *Gakkōhen* 日本教育文庫, 学校篇, Dōbun Kan, reprinted edtn. 1977: 170). With the Kansei reform, the shogun finally becomes ex-



Following specification of the agency of the ceremony, the text of the Hiroshima invocation itself also differed from that of Zhu Xi's retreat liturgy;<sup>49</sup> it employed the wording of the Ming (Ming dynasty; post Jiajing reform [1530]) state invocation and continued:

Teacher, your virtue is distributed over Heaven and Earth, your Way crowns past and present, you edited and retold the six classics and pass down ordinances (*ken* 憲) for ten thousand generations.<sup>50</sup>

Here, appropriately for an official domain school ceremony performed at the behest of a daimyo, were echoes of the 'cosmic ordering' of the ancient state rituals; Confucius is addressed as the timeless, historically transcendent transmitter of the institutions that create and regulate the socio-political order.<sup>51</sup>

---

plicitly established as the agent; SUDŌ Toshio 須藤敏夫: *Kinsei Nihon sekiten no kenkyū* 近世日本積奠の研究, Kyōto: Shibun Kaku Shuppan 2001: 143. For Tekisai himself, see *Procedures for the sekisai and preface* (*Sekisai gisetsu kōgi narabi jo* 積菜儀節考議並序; for reference, see above, note 34. Tekisai had found the wording of Zhu Xi's invocations to be 'verbose and difficult to use as a permanent service'; like Shunsui, he used a Ming official wording for his invocation.

49 Zhu's addresses to the Sage seem to have taken the form of 'announcements' (*gaowen* 告文), more discursive and lengthier than the formulaic 'invocations'. See for example his "Cangzhou jingshe gao xiansheng wen" 滄洲精舍告先聖文 in *Zhuzi daquan* 朱子大全, *Sibu beiyao* 四部備要 edtn., *juan* 86: 12a–12b.

50 LI Zhizao 李之藻: *Pangong liyue shu* 頓宮禮樂疏. [*Wen yuange*] *Siku quanshu* 文淵閣四庫全書 edtn., Taipei: Taiwan Shangwu Yinshu Guan 1986: 651–88; LI Dongyang 李東陽: *Da Ming huidian* 大明會典, 5 vols., Jiangsu: Guangling Guji Keyinshe 1989, *juan* 91: 24b, 1444.

51 The Hiroshima rite was not the only 'retreat' *sekisai* ritual to be politicized in this way. From more than a century and a half earlier, the Edo Hayashi *kajuku* rite had earlier shown a similar pattern of evolution. It had started in 1633 from the Zhu Xi 'retreat' ritual. The later correspondence of Razan's son Gahō 鷲峯 (1618–80) stated in 1650 that this liturgy had been adopted 'in order that we might demonstrate the bequeathed style of the sages'. TAKAHASHI Akinori 高橋章則: "Kinsei shoki no jukyō to 'rei' – Rinke Juku ni okeru sekisairei no seiritsu wo chūshin to shite" 近世初期の儒教と「礼」林家塾における積菜礼の成立を中心として, MINAMOTO Ryōen 源了圓, TAMAGAKE Hiroyuki 玉懸博之 eds.: *Kokka to shūkyō: Nihon shisō shi ronshū* 国歌と宗教: 日本思想史論集. Kyōto: Shibunkakaku 1992: 248, quoting *Gahō Rin Gakushi bunshū* 鷲峯林学士文集, *kan* 27. See also Hayashi Razan's letter of 1654 to Ishikawa Jōzan 石川丈山 (1583–1672) mentioning a ceremony of that year still based on the 'retreat liturgy', where he writes "We wanted to copy Shushi's 朱子 *Sōshū gi* 滄州儀 (*sic*), but in a different age and different place, there were minor differences"; HAYASHI Razan: *Hayashi Razan bunshū* 林羅山文集, comp. Hayashi Gahō 林鷲峰 (1661). Ōsaka: Kōbun Sha 1930: 92. But, by 1670, in order to site itself in the official warrior-dominated world of its time, it, too, had grafted political elements derived from later Chinese official practice, such as the Ming state invocation, onto that structure. In ad-

Such was the liturgy drawn up for the Hiroshima Gakumonjo by Rai Kyōhei. It is not altogether clear when performance of this ceremony was initiated. It may be that some sort of ceremony had already been conducted in front of the wooden tablets whose inscription had been solicited from the daimyo from 1783. Still earlier, it is quite likely some sort of ceremony had, in turn, been conducted from considerably earlier in the presence of the picture that the tablets replaced. But Shunsui's plea for tablets in 1783 was surely intended to signal a new beginning. If so, that seems to have been delayed for several years. Shunsui himself was on duty as tutor to the daimyo's heir in Edo more than in Hiroshima during the Tenmei and early Kansei period.<sup>52</sup> He was not in a position easily to supervise the ceremony in Hiroshima. And, though the MS of Kyōhei's directives is dated 1790/ii, there seems to be no record that the ceremony was performed that spring. Shunsui himself was still in Edo at the time. There, he had watched the Shōheizaka ceremony the preceding year, on 1789/ii/22 and had afterwards been shown the paraphernalia 'item by item'. He returned to Hiroshima on 5/ii/1790, and the first record of the ceremony in his own diary is from 1790/viii/9. He held two, rather than the more normal single, rehearsals, suggesting that this performance may indeed have been inaugural.<sup>53</sup> The memoir by Shunsui's son Rai San'yō 頼山陽 (1780–1832) records that his father was the chief sacrificer (*seiken kan* 正獻官) and that he was 'especially' supplied by the domain authorities with a ceremonial court hat (*eboshi* 烏帽子), outer robe (*hō* 袍), and gown (*hitatare* 直垂).<sup>54</sup>

Once inaugurated, the ceremony seems to have been performed with the same punctiliousness as the Rai domestic rituals.<sup>55</sup> A regular pattern was established. It involved a rehearsal, usually two days preceding the ceremony, and

---

dition it also incorporated cultural display derived from the Heian period version of the rite. Similar co-optation of the originally unofficial Zhu Xi ritual by the political authority of the daimyo and inclusion of cultural display elements are found in the Okayama *hankō* and at Taku; see also above, note 47.

52 For Shunsui's attendances in Edo dated from departure from and return to Hiroshima, see the table in GRAMLICH-OKA 2010: 19.

53 The first rehearsal, on viii/3, was, unusually, for *igi* 肄儀 (perhaps basic 'ritual postures and movements'); the second, on viii/6, is referred to as a more conventional rehearsal (*shūrei* 習礼).

54 RAI 1911: 88.

55 The best record is Shunsui's own diary. However, he was absent in Edo, and his wife's diary records observances during his absence when other members of the household participated or attended.

abstinence, at least for Shunsui himself, on the day before the ceremony itself. Twice on visits to the castle preceding the ceremony, Shunsui was officially requested by the domain authorities to act as ‘chief libationer’.<sup>56</sup> In his absence on duty in Edo, moreover, the ceremony was evidently still staged; other members of the household participated, as his wife recorded in her diary.<sup>57</sup>

### *Hiroshima and Edo*

How, then does this ceremony relate to the liturgically reformed ceremony at the Bakufu College first performed in 1800? As already stated, the orthodoxy of Rai Shunsui in Hiroshima has been regarded as one possible source of the Confucian doctrinal orthodoxy imposed on the Bakufu College by the famous “Kansei igaku no kin” 寛政異学之禁 [Kansei prohibition on heterodoxy] of 1790.<sup>58</sup> As early as 1784, Shunsui had drawn the attention of Matsudaira Sadanobu 松平定信 (1758–1829), the principal driver of the reform, to the need for orthodoxy already and had had the opportunity to discuss Confucianism and the problem of heterodoxy with him.<sup>59</sup> There is no reason to challenge the view that Shunsui may have been among those who influenced this development at the Bakufu College and that he ‘played a role behind the reform’.<sup>60</sup> An influence in the same direction of Zhu Xi orthodoxy is suggested by the adoption by the Bakufu College from 1792 of Shunsui’s practice in Hiroshima,

56 *Shunsui nikki*: 1799/ii/01; 1802/ii/22.

57 E.g. *Baishi nikki* 梅颯日記, *Rai Sanyō zensho, furoku* 頼山陽全書附録: 1793/ii/4; 1800/viii/7.

58 For an excellent exploration of this episode, see the three-part series of articles by Robert L. BACKUS in the *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*: “The Relationship of Confucianism to the Tokugawa Bakufu as Revealed in the Kansei Educational Reform”, 34 (1974): 97–162; “The Kansei Prohibition of Heterodoxy and its Effects on Education” 39.1 (June 1979): 55–106; “The Motivation of Confucian Orthodoxy in Tokugawa Japan” 39.2 (December 1979): 275–338. See also: Robert L. BACKUS: “Matsudaira Sadanobu and Samurai Education”, C. Andrew GERSTLE ed.: *18th Century Japan: Culture and Society*, paperback edtn. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon 2000: 132–52. The circumstances of Shunsui’s meeting with Sadanobu are described in detail in BACKUS 1979.2: 291–94.

59 *Tenmei taisai roku* 天明大政録, and “Sadanobu no Shirakawa ni kaeru wo okuru no jo” 定信の白河に還るを送るの序 quoted in TOKUTOMI Iichirō 徳富猪一郎: *Kinsei Nihon kokumin shi: Matsudaira Sadanobu jidai* 近世日本国民史・松平定信時代, Meiji Shoin 1936: 144–45; BACKUS 1979.2: 293–94.

60 BACKUS: 1979.2: 297.

apparently established already in the Tenmei 天明 period (1781–89), of lecturing on the *Hakuroku Dō Shoin keiji* 白鹿洞書院揭示, Zhu Xi's short primer of Confucian ethics, to the audience annually at the annual opening lecture on i/15. This text, not previously used in the Rinke academy, was accorded almost talismanic value as a symbol of dedication to the teaching of Zhu Xi by the Kimon school and was distributed free to those attending the lecture.<sup>61</sup>

The question of whether the Hiroshima *teisai* itself directly or indirectly influenced the later Bakufu College liturgical reform is less easily solved. Objectively, there might seem to be much in the Hiroshima rite that might recommend it to the reformers. In some ways it appeared perfectly to reflect and sacralize the College's Zhu Xi orthodoxy. Its basic form had the authority of Zhu Xi himself, and it paid explicit veneration to the leading figures of the Neo-Confucian 'transmission of the Way' (*daotong* 道統) as subsidiary venerands. In using an aniconic tablet inscribed in the hand of the daimyo, it had also been subtly politicized, a feature that could be replicated in Edo<sup>62</sup> and might have made the Hiroshima form of the ceremony attractive to the Edo reformers. The patent seriousness of the Rai liturgy might also have appealed to men striving to promote moral regeneration among the bakufu housemen.

Moreover, Shunsui alone among the group of Confucian scholars associated with the Shōhei Kō over the period of the Kansei Reform appears to have had prior experience of establishing this ritual. He certainly had the opportunity to communicate his experience to the leaders of the Bakufu College community. On at least three occasions during his visits to Edo in the early 1790s, he had watched the ceremony at the Bakufu College in its pre-reform version.<sup>63</sup> This

---

61 For this text, specially esteemed by the Kimon school, see *Yamazaki Ansai zenshū, ge* 山崎闇斎全集・下, Nihon Koten Gakkai 1937. See also ISHIKAWA Ken 石川謙: "Shōhei Zaka Gakumon Jo no hattatsu katei to sono yōshiki" 昌平坂学問所の発達過程とその様式, *Ochanomizu Joshi Daigaku Jinbun kagaku kiyō* お茶の水女子大学人文科学紀要 7 [October 1955]: 26–27; INUTSUKA 1977: 84; also the *Gakumon Jo kyōsoku oboegaki* 学問所教則覚書 in NKSS 7: 99; dated 'u shōgatsu' 卯正月[1795?]. Shunsui was not the only one to promote this text, however. Another Zhu Xi zealot, Koga Seiri of Saga 佐賀, had promoted it in his domain; there, according to the *Kōdō Kan gakusoku, Zasshiki* 弘道館雜式 (1781), a new year's ceremony on i/6 required attendance at an 'opening school lecture' on this text (*Gaku Kaikō* 学開講). KASAI 1970: 1610–12, 2080. Seiri had been the first guest lecturer at the Bakufu College, during 1792 (INUTSUKA 1977: 84) and could have introduced the new year lecture then. However, BACKUS 1979.2: 297.

62 The rebuilt shrine preserved the plaque inscribed 'Taisei Den' 大成殿 in the hand of the fifth shogun.

63 1789/ii/22; 1790/ii/16; 1791/viii/26.

was during the Rectorship of Hayashi Kinpō 林金峰 (1767–93), when poetry composition was still a part of the liturgical sequence of the ceremony in the shrine itself. As already mentioned, such versification was not a feature of the Rai Hiroshima rite. It was also subsequently to be dropped from the Bakufu College *sekiten* on 1794/viii/2, after Hayashi Jussai 林述斎 (1768–1841) had succeeded Kinpō as rector.<sup>64</sup> Shunsui's influence is circumstantially possible here, though there is nothing other than circumstantial evidence to support this.

Shunsui remained on close terms with several participants in the reform, men such as Shibano Ritsuzan 柴野栗山 (1736–1807), Okada Kansen 岡田寒泉 (1740–1816), and Shunsui's kinsman by marriage, Bitō Jishū 尾藤二洲 (1745–1813). These men were fellow members of the Yamazaki Ansai 山崎闇斎 (Kimon) school of Neo-Confucianism. It is difficult to believe that Shunsui would not have discussed the ceremony in this company.<sup>65</sup> The ultimate decision concerning the liturgical reform, however, must have lain with the head of the University, Hayashi Jussai, a man of very different background and character. He was the third son of the daimyo of Iwamura 岩村, Matsudaira Norimori 松平乗蘊, appointed heir to the Hayashi lineage in the 7th month of 1793, and Head of the Bakufu College (*Daigaku no kami* 大学頭) in the 12th month.<sup>66</sup> There is little evidence to suggest that Shunsui and Jussai were close.<sup>67</sup> Furthermore, Shunsui was not in Edo at the time when the basic features of the liturgical reform policy were formulated in committee (autumn 1799 – early spring 1800). His penultimate tour of duty in the military capital was from 1800/iii/8 to 1801/v/16. During this visit, he was a member of staff as visiting lecturer at the Bakufu College (invited 1800/x/7; received payment

64 INUTSUKA 1977: 87.

65 That he discussed the *sekiten* in Edo is strongly suggested by his association there with the Tosa 土佐 Kimon school Confucianist Miura Kōnan 箕浦江南 (1730–1816; Ugenji 右源次). Miura was a Kimon scholar and poet who consorted with Bitō Jishū, Shibano Ritsuzan, Shunsui and others (see *Shunsui nikki* e.g. 1793/ii/2). He subsequently wrote to the domain authorities in Hiroshima asking to view the ceremony there (letter editorially assigned to the years 1797–99; 'Kengen ōmon' 献言応問 3, SI 680). It seems that at least he was sent a copy of the Hiroshima directives. Shunsui's diary records meetings with Miura, for instance suggestively on 1801/i/17, after lecturing at the Bakufu College and paying his respects at the Yushima 湯島 shrine. But Kōnan had been active in cult of Confucius in Tosa since at least 1761, when he signed an encomium on a portrait of Confucius. NKSS 6: 137–380; for a biographical sketch, see KASAI 1970: 1514–15.

66 BACKUS 1974: 126.

67 Jussai is not listed among Shunsui's contacts in Anna BEERENS's prosopographical study, p. 132.

1801/iv/6). Over these months he certainly retained his interest in ritual. He records watching the ceremony at the College on 1801/ii/19; and he participated in [?] ‘work groups’ (*kaigyō* 会業) on Zhu Xi’s famous manual of domestic ritual, the *Wengong jiali*.<sup>68</sup> He finally lectured on this text on three occasions shortly before his return to Hiroshima.<sup>69</sup> But this visit to Edo came too late for him to have participated directly in decisions about the reform of the Bakufu College *sekiten* liturgy.

The committee to determine the reform of the Bakufu College *sekiten* ritual delivered its judgement in early 1800. And, indeed, their choice was radical and, at first sight, surprising. The reformers turned not to a Zhu Xi version of the rite, but to a pre-Neo-Confucian form. They revived the ancient *Engi shiki* version of the rite. While they retained the Sung Neo-Confucians as venerated, they dropped mention of their names from the invocation in favour of the *Engi shiki* pre-Neo-Confucian wording, thus liturgically derogating the scholars claimed as the basis for the College’s orthodoxy. It is difficult to believe that Shunsui himself would have proposed such a solution. Only one aspect of the reformed rite, however, was in accord with the Hiroshima *teisai*: its sobriety, its eschewal of all ‘cultural display’ save music, was in tune with the puritanical moral revivalism of the Hiroshima ceremony and of the Kimon group of scholars generally. Thus the reformers, in their turn, created a ceremony in which, in the words of a contemporary, ‘whatever was concerned with empty ornament was abandoned’.<sup>70</sup> Here, a general influence from Shunsui and his brand of Confucian puritanism is possible. Cumulatively, however, the evidence suggests that Shunsui’s influence over the Edo liturgical reform was at very most limited and diffuse.

Indeed there is little in common between the Bakufu College revival of the *Engi shiki* and the Hiroshima ceremony. Hiroshima-style doctrinal and exegetical orthodoxy and puritanism were no doubt desirable to the reformers, but Hiroshima-style liturgy and evangelical intention were apparently not. What prompted their choice? The reasons are complex and range widely; their thorough exploration is outside the scope of this short article. It may be noted briefly, however, that the reformers’ response to the *sekiten* followed a well-established pattern of ambivalence among wielders of state power throughout the history of the rite in Japan; it at once secured perpetuation of its perfor-

---

68 *Shunsui nikki*: 1801/i/24, 28, etc.

69 *Ibid.*: 1801/iv/9, 11, 12.

70 INUTSUKA 1977: 96.



mance but the same time also constrained its appeal and influence. Confucianism was necessary for aspects of the legitimacy of the state, but it also challenged the hereditary and ascriptive principles that were basic to its socio-political fabric. It must be treated with caution.

More immediate causes, no less ambivalent, also prompted the reformers' choice. They will be found partly on the early nineteenth-century Japanese *zeitgeist*, and partly in the minds of such men as the driver of the reform, Matsudaira Sadanobu himself and of its other architects including Shibano Ritsuzan and the new Head of the Bakufu College, Hayashi Jussai. In one direction, at a time when the bakufu was coming under political pressure, they evidently wanted a liturgy that reflected its dignity and authority and even its institutional legitimacy. What could better dignify the Bakufu's academy than the 'cosmic ordering' metropolitan ceremony of the ancient Japanese state from the Engi 延喜 period (901–23), a time celebrated for its 'good government'? Respect for the established tradition of Rinke grand performances of the *sekiten* since the reign of the fifth shogun may also have encouraged the choice of a dignified state version of the rite. In a different direction, however, fear of the perceived dangerously softening influence of Confucianism on warriors at a time of concern for national security and respect for the frugality of the regime of the eighth shogun pointed towards constraint and the elimination of cultural aspects of the ceremony. It is also possible that the more authoritarian among the reformers may have felt wary of a ritual that could be interpreted as sacralizing the agency of the individual practitioner of the Neo-Confucian way. But above all, the liturgical reform, in all its complexity of motivation, was informed and given coherence by the utilitarian thought of Ogyū Sorai.<sup>71</sup>

Clearly, Shunsui in Hiroshima and the reformers in Edo had different ideological horizons and agendas and different expectations of the ceremony. Their separate worlds are reflected also on the level of personalities in their contrasting social backgrounds and attitudes to Confucian ritual practice. Shunsui was by origin from the peasantry and, more proximately, *petit bourgeois* (his family traded in indigo dye). Of his social provenance and that of his associate promoters of orthodoxy, it has recently been written that 'most [...] were from a West country rural village (*gōson* 郷村) background.' These communities had

---

71 For an exploratory survey of these considerations, see James McMullen: "Ogyū Sorai, Matsudaira Sadanobu and the Kansei Worship of Confucius", *Ajia-Nippon Kenkyū Senta kiyō* アジア・日本研究センター紀要 6 (2011): 1–22.

been threatened by ‘disintegration’ from the Hōreki 宝暦 period (1751–64). Shunsui and his group identified in Zhu Xi orthodoxy and its associated moral practice ‘a path by which they hoped to be able to solve the crisis’.<sup>72</sup> Shunsui was intense, disciplined and devotional; according to his son, ‘[b]y nature he was stiff and formal, strict and orderly’; he ‘not infrequently point[ed] out one’s misconduct to [one’s] face’.<sup>73</sup> Throughout his life he set himself exacting standards in performing Confucian ritual.<sup>74</sup>

Jussai’s Confucianism was very different. By birth a member of the feudal elite, he seems to have had an aristocrat’s permissive and flamboyant life style. He fathered nine sons and nine daughters but had no official wife; his domestic establishment, including grandchildren, ran to 165 persons.<sup>75</sup> He had little of the Kimon school intense dedication to self-cultivation. For him, in the style of Sorai’s utilitarianism, orthodox Zhu Xi Confucianism was a public and an instrumental necessity of governance rather than a personal path. Jussai was insouciant towards the religious or liturgical aspect of Confucianism. Shunsui himself reported critically on Jussai’s perfunctory conduct of domestic Confucian rituals.

In worship and sacrifice, he never did them [as a couple] with a wife. Five or six disciples were in charge. [Only] at the time of offering, would the libationer [sc. the head of the college, Jussai himself] appear and handle [the paraphernalia?]. There was an invocationer in charge of matters. In general in his rituals of sacrifice, the paraphernalia were coarse and nothing was done in accord with the rules. [...] He disposed of the left-over oblations to disciples. He never checked [whether or not] those participating were in mourning. Everything was slapdash.<sup>76</sup>

Jussai’s indifference to ritual at the level of personal or devotional practice may have influenced the reformers’ decision to revive the relatively impersonal liturgy of the pre-Neo-Confucian ancient state *Engi shiki* liturgy. His

---

72 TSUJIMOTO Masashi 辻本雅史: *Kinsei kyōiku shisō shi no kenkyū* 近世教育思想史の研究, Kyōto: Shibun Kaku 1990: 222.

73 BACKUS 1979.2: 292, quoting RAI 1911: 88–89.

74 RAI 1911: 88.

75 SUZUKI Miyao 鈴木三八男: *Seidō monogatari* 聖堂物語, Shibun Kai 1989: 30.

76 RAI Shunsui: *Shōroku* 掌録 (1800–01), quoted in MINAKAWA 1997: 204. I am grateful to Bettina Gramlich-Oka for this reference.

detachment, documented later from the log book of the Bakufu College,<sup>77</sup> may have been one factor contributing to the ultimate etiolation of the ceremony. But that is another story, for another time.

### Conclusion

The question of the possible influence of the Hiroshima domain's *teisai* on the Bakufu College *sekiten* serves to bring out the special characteristics of the former, the main focus of this article, and to provide an instance of the variety of practice in the sacrifice to Confucius in Tokugawa Japan. It will have been evident from the analysis of the Hiroshima ceremony that historically the liturgy of this domain's *teisai* was a hybrid. The basic liturgical framework was simple, plain, brief, devotional and relatively apolitical. It had emanated in Song China from a small, voluntary community of men who shared a common spiritual and religious quest relatively detached from national political institutions; in its original form, it had some sense of spontaneity, some sense of freedom and an evangelical purpose. In Hiroshima, however, it had become politicized; grafted into it were elements of a more directly political nuance than found in Zhu Xi's original liturgy. Its object of veneration, the tablet for the spirit of Confucius, proclaimed a link with the authority of the domain ruler; its invocation was borrowed from the official prayer of Ming China; it now had an element of 'cosmic ordering'.

True, it seems effectively to have retained its intensity and spirit of devotion. But informing it now was also an additional and different motivation: the intention to sacralize a moral and intellectual conformity imposed by political authority on a society much larger than Zhu Xi's voluntary group of fellow aspirants to Neo-Confucian enlightenment. No doubt, it retained something of Zhu Xi's evangelical intention. But the wider Hiroshima socio-political community was culturally quite different from Zhu's. It was politically dominated by warriors not necessarily receptive to the values immanent in the Zhu Xi version; its ethos was coloured by military command. There was now something of a disciplinarian purpose to the ceremony. In terms of its structure and liturgical content, what had originally been a devotional ritual of the 'ethical action' or 'moral redemption' type, had been assimilated into a vehicle for the

---

77 HASHIMOTO Akihiko 橋本昭彦 ed.: *Shōhei Zaka Gakumon Jo nikki* 昌平坂学問所日記, 3 vols., Shibun Kai, 1998–2006, vols. 1–2, *passim*.

ideological agenda and authority of the domain's daimyo and the Confucian scholar who served as his ideologue.

Was the Hiroshima Rai *sekisai* successful, and, if so, what was the nature of its success? Could a liturgy conceived for a small, voluntary group of educated men be adapted to serve the perceived need for discipline and unity in a much larger feudal community? Did the daimyo's calligraphy on the tablet that served as 'host' and his citation as commissioner of the sacrifice suffice to inspire the domain-wide unity and conformity that Shunsui desired? Or was the ceremony simply an inconsequential social occasion orchestrated by a man marginal, despite his claims to be otherwise, to the dynamics of his domain's power structure? These questions are difficult to answer in the affirmative; further research is required. But there is at least some evidence that the ceremony was enjoyed among the academic community of Hiroshima. Following its completion, a congenial, celebratory party was held, as in one form or another so frequently happened in the history of the rite in Japan.

From the Director on down to those who routinely appeared in the school, down to the little men and messengers, and beyond them to those from the houses of the teachers, each and every one came to the school and received the wine of good fortune. Though it didn't amount to [good] cuisine, with the appropriate rice and side dishes they all enjoyed themselves.<sup>78</sup>

Shunsui's diary records the continued performance of the rite until the year of his death in 1816 and the Rai family involvement in the ceremony certainly continued until 1829.<sup>79</sup> And it seems likely, with the Rai family role in the domain school, to have continued until the abolition of the school itself after the Restoration. The Hiroshima ceremony seems also to have influenced the Confucian rite at the Nitchi Kan 日知館 school (founded 1837) in the small *fu-dai* eastern domain of Tanaka 田中.<sup>80</sup> If the ceremony did enjoy some success, it was surely in part on account of the exemplary commitment, the high sense of purpose, or, perhaps in Confucian terms, the 'virtue' of its Rai proponents.

But if Shunsui had hoped to secure his daimyo's personal participation in the rite with the enhancement of his Confucian cause that would have resulted,

---

78 SHUNSUI: *Chikukan shōroku* 竹館小録, SI 778.

79 The final entry in the Rai diaries to record the ceremony seems to be in *Baishi nikki*, entry for 1829/viii/5.

80 The Tanaka domain 'more or less follows *Teisai gichū* 丁祭儀注'; KASAI 1970: 581; NKSS 1: 209.

he seems not to have succeeded. Only once, on 1798/viii/26, does his diary record participation by the daimyo house, in the form of the ‘attendance’ (*rin* 臨) at the ceremony of the daimyo’s heir, the future eighth daimyo, Asano Nari-kata 浅野齐賢. Hiroshima was not to be among the contemporary domains in which the daimyo made the signal symbolic gesture of assuming active headship of the cult of Confucius.<sup>81</sup> Rather, like many domain rulers of the period, the daimyo opted for a more secular and simpler ‘attendance at the school’ (*rinkō* 臨校). He had school officials lecture in turn three times a month on the *Analects*, with an audience of ‘officials and those out of office down to the common people’.<sup>82</sup> Nor, apparently, despite the ideological fit of aspects of the Rai ceremony with the orthodoxy that the reformers in Edo claimed as the basis of their attempted moral regeneration of the bakufu samurai community, did his metropolitan colleagues find his ceremony to have the dignity and historical authority required for sacralizing the Confucian programme of the Bakufu College, the paramount Confucian educational institution of the land.

---

81 The role of libationer was performed by the daimyo in person during the period in some 11 domains (McMULLEN, forthcoming).

82 NKSS 2: 655. Further investigation is required to determine whether, or how often, the daimyo himself attended these lectures when in Hiroshima.